

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/926,763 05/20/2002		05/20/2002	Dianne Beverley Croteau	10748-006	3008
1059	7590	05/02/2003			
BERESKIN		ARR	EXAMINER		
	REET W	EST-SUITE 4000 I	NELSON JR, MILTON		
TORONTO, CANADA	ON M3	H 3Y2	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3636		
				DATE MAILED: 05/02/2003	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

41									
. , ,		Application No	P. •	Applicant(s)					
• •		09/926,763	3	CROTEAU ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
		Milton Nelson,		3636					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	ears on the cov	er sheet with the c	orrespondence add	dress				
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur - Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Issions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vero to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, ho within the statutory n will apply and will expiration to cause the application	wever, may a reply be tim ninimum of thirty (30) days te SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONEI	ely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	r. ommunication.				
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·							
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	nis action is non-	-final.						
3)□ Dispositi	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims								
-	Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application	1.							
, —	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra		eration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
•	Claim(s) <u>1-4,14-17 and 27-29</u> is/are rejected.								
•	Claim(s) <u>5-13,19-26,30 and 31</u> is/are objected	to.							
· ·	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o		rement.						
•	on Papers								
9) 🗌 -	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.							
10)🛛 -	The drawing(s) filed on <u>17 December 2001</u> is/a	ire: a)□ accepte	d or b) 🛛 objected t	to by the Examine	r.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to th								
11) 🗌	The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)∏ appro	ved b)⊡ disappro	ved by the Examin	er.				
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	ply to this Office	action.						
12) 🗌 🧻	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120								
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been re	ceived.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been re	ceived in Applicati	on No					
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Buse the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule	e 17.2(a)).		Stage				
14)⊠ <i>A</i>	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest	ic priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisiona	l application).				
) The translation of the foreign language pro Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest								
Attachmen	t(s)								
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>-</u> -	4) [5) [6) [y (PTO-413) Paper No Patent Application (PT					
1 C. Dotont and T	rademark Office								

Art Unit: 3636

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information referred to in the information disclosure statement file March 22, 2002 has been considered.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: "100a", "100b" and "100c". A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claims 5-13, 18-26, 30 and 31 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, claims 5-13, 18-26, 30 and 31 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Art Unit: 3636

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4, 14-17 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the downward load of a person's trunk" in line 3.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the area of the buttocks" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the sit bones" in lines 4 to 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the floor" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the lesser of" in lines 2 to 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is also not clear what is being set forth by the recitation.

Lines 4-6 of claim 4 are indefinite since Applicant defines the invention relative to a variable (a person) that is infinitely broad. A structural feature of the invention should be defined relative to other structural features of the invention. Similarly note claim 17.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the downward load of a person's trunk" in line 3.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 3636

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the sit bones" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the floor" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Line 2 of claim 28 is grammatically vague. Note the recitation "the from the person which".

In lines 4 and 5 of claim 28, it is unclear if "a person's" is intended to be the same as the previously set forth "the person".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Tholkes (5054852).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3636

Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tholkes (5054852). Tholkes clearly presents all claimed structural features of the instant invention. Tholkes lacks only the specifically claimed method of constructing steps of the instant invention. It would have been obvious, if not inherent, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to construct the chair of Tholkes by the claimed method of construction steps. Constructing the chair of Tholkes by the claimed method provides efficient, safe and easy steps for providing a chair.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Milton Nelson, Jr. whose telephone number is 7033082117. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 5:30-3:00.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 7033053597 for regular communications and 7033053597 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 7033082168.

Art Unit: 3636

Milton Nelson, Jr. Primary Examiner Art Unit 3636

mn

April 29, 2003